culture is the " worship of success." The recurrent theme that dominates this book seems to be the idea that in dealing with current social problems anthropology has been, and can be, a practical success. In almost every chapter Kluckhohn has gone to great lengths to drive this point home. The overall result is, in the opinion of the reviewer, singularly unconvincing.

COLIN ROSSER.

Mead, Margaret. *Male and Female.* London, 1950. Gollancz. Pp. 304. Price 18s.

DR. MEAD'S book falls into two parts. The first, an analysis of observed differences between the human sexes, is based on a study of seven Pacific cultures made by Dr. Mead herself. Ethical and value judgments are here scanty. The second part consists of a discussion of contemporary American culture which is assessed, albeit implicitly, in terms of a standard of values.

In the author's seven cultures, diverse relations between the sexes are found. The ways in which the peoples here described " pattern the relation between the sexes," should, the author thinks, give us " some greater appreciation of the value for human civilisation of the presence of the two sexes, of the importance of this counterpoint that we sometimes ignore grievously, often distort, and have never used to the full."

In a chapter entitled " Sex and Temperament," Dr. Mead poses the question: Can we, following some absolute standard, regard some qualities as inherently " more male " than others and hence imagine an ideal man or " norm " of maleness possessing all such qualities in their most eminent degree? If yes, we can look upon individual men and diverse cultural stereotypes of men as departing in greater or lesser degree from this norm. But is there, she asks, only one norm of maleness? By Western standards the Balinese man looks " feminine " and the Balinese woman " boyish." Does this approximation mean that the Balinese man is less " male " and the Balinese woman less " female," or simply that the Balinese type of masculinity and femininity is different—in other words, that there are differences in kind as well as differences in degree?

Dr. Mead suggests that we should recognise several different constitutional categories of masculinity and corresponding femininity, within each of which differences in degree may be discerned. Such a situation would complicate assessments of *degrees* of maleness and femaleness. A " fiery initiating woman " may look like a lion if compared with a rabbitty man; but if contrasted with a fiery initiating man of her own type will look, not like a lion, but like a lioness in her proper setting.

" Just as one would not be able to identify the sex of a male rabbit by comparing its behaviour with that of a lion, a stag, or a peacock as well as by comparing rabbit buck with doe, lion with lioness, stag with doe, and peacock with peahen—so it may well be that if we could disabuse our minds of the habits of lumping all males together and all females together and worrying about the beards of one and the breasts of another, and look instead for males and females of different types, we would present to children a much more intelligible problem."

Each society will tend to select and idealize one particular type of masculinity and femininity, which may not necessarily " correspond " with each other. We may indeed expect to find the lion lying down with the lamb if society happens to select for its ideals lion-like males and lamb-like females. But every accepted " stereotype " is narrow, and may lead to the waste of valuable talent if people dare not use their particular gifts for fear of being unsexed. We should instead, Dr. Mead suggests, " take the primary fact of sex membership as a cross-constitutional classification " without allowing it to obscure the essential characteristics of the various categories of male and female.

Interesting possibilities for marriage guidance are disclosed by this suggestion. A society may be imagined as recognizing several types of categories of male or female.

Research might indicate which male and female categories would most successfully assort together. It might for example be found that the ideal mate for the rabbit-man was the rabbit-woman, the similarities between them being such as to promote harmony rather than discord. Within the rabbit category, therefore, strictly endogamous laws should prevail. But it might also be found that the lion-man was the worst possible mate for the lion-woman, since the similarities arising from their common leoninity—common ambition, common ferocity—were calculated to produce unbearable stresses. Within the lion group, therefore, strictly exogamous laws might be appropriate.

But, declares Dr. Mead, " we need much more material on the extent to which this sort of constitutional types may actually be identified and studied before we can answer the next questions about differential strength and stability and flexibility of cultures in which ideals are a blend, or a composite, or a single lyric theme." We should be able to recognise and define the types before we can pronounce on their respective compatibility.

Dr. Mead further discusses what she calls " basic regularities in sex development." The fact, for example, that both sexes are nursed by a mother results, she thinks, in girls learning that they must simply *be*, while boys learn that they must *become*. Boys must learn to differentiate themselves from their mothers, while girls, unaware of any urgent need to act or become, can rest comfortably identified with her. One wonders if Dr. Mead has stumbled on an explanation of the fact that only men are known to have propounded philosophies which assert that Being is Becoming.

The author regards as " basic " the counterbalance of the woman's procreative powers by the man's desire for achievement. " In every known human society," she writes, " the male's need for achievement can be recognized." She regards the female as continuously " sure " of its rôle. The life of the female starts with the " simple identification with her mother," and ends with the " sureness that that identification is true and that she has made another human being." But the male has no such assurance. He must continually prove his sex prerogative by arrogating to himself rights, or by monopolizing certain occupations and activities. " In a great number of human societies men's sureness of their sex rôle is tied up with their right or ability to practice some activity that women are not allowed to practice. Their maleness, in fact, has to be underwritten by preventing women from entering some field or performing some feat."

Dr. Mead sees a perennial problem of civilisation in the male's need to attain and enjoy a " solid sense of irreversible achievement." Speculation along these lines suggests to Dr. Mead that the decay of civilizations has proceeded from a failure to recognize, as specifically " masculine," activities and traits that sufficiently reward the male's desire for achievement. Women, the author thinks, are not subject to this inescapable urge to achieve ; the mere fulfilment of their biological rôle brings to them a completely satisfying sense of " irreversible achievement." Indeed, she goes so far as to suggest that the will to create or achieve in any other field than child-bearing is implanted in women solely by education. For them, " divine discontent " is invariably the result of indoctrination.

The second half of the book is devoted to a discussion of the " complex American culture." Though she rarely condemns explicitly, Dr. Mead conveys to the reader the impression that she tacitly disapproves of many of its traits. She describes and presents, allowing the reader to infer ; but her mode of presentation leaves little doubt as to her attitude. She clearly condemns such products of civilization as the feeding bottle, which is " interposed " between the mother and child ; and such cultural contradictions as the dating system, which provides a pre-marital training in behaviour precisely opposed to that required by the American ideal of marriage. The American ideal of freedom of choice in marriage she describes as embracing freedom to change one's mind. Hence the American marriage

is " the most difficult marriage form that the human race has ever attempted." If Americans desire that no one should be enslaved by the past mistake of imagining the " real thing " in marriage to be where in fact there is no " reality," the price they have to pay is that " both husband and wife face the need to re-choose each other, to reassert and re-establish the never permanent claim of one upon the other's choice. The wife in curl-papers is replaced by the wife who puts on lipstick before she wakes her husband, and the husband with a wandering eye finds that his eye wanders less happily because at any moment it may light upon someone whom he will choose instead of a wife."

It is sad that a book of this calibre should be marred by a literary style which is both turgid and slipshod. The reader is continually oppressed by sentences such as the following: " If little girls have a rhythm of growth which means that their own sex appears to them as initially less sure than their brothers and so gives them a little false flick towards compensatory achievement that almost always dies down before the certainty of maternity, this probably means a limitation of their sense of ambition." Much of the freshness of Dr. Mead's ideas is thus lost on the reader who is both exhausted and irritated by the mere effort of discovering the simple meaning or even the grammatical structure of her sentences.

Dr. Mead's standpoint is that of the anthropologist whose recognition of cultural diversity engenders tolerance. A stereotyped and accepted pattern of what should separately constitute appropriate conduct for a man and for a woman seems to her to constrain her fellow-countrymen in a sort of cultural straight jacket, limiting the free expression of creative potentiality and generating intolerance. It is in Dr. Mead's vision as an anthropologist rather than in her proposed remedies as a social reformer that the value of this book resides.

CARMEN BLACKER.

BLOOD GROUPS

Race, R. R., and **Sanger, Ruth.** *Blood Groups in Man.* Oxford, 1950. Blackwell Scientific Publications. Pp. 290. Price 30s.

THIS book contains an up-to-the-minute account of the human blood groups. It is written in a lucid style and is amply supplied with tables and figures.

The authors set out to give a comprehensive account of the inheritance of blood groups in man with particular emphasis on the work done since 1940. For this task they could not be better qualified since they themselves have contributed so much to the subject in recent years. They are at their best when describing in their own work the delights of unravelling a serological problem.

The introductory chapters include a discussion of the uses of the blood groups in the study of human genetics. The suitability of the blood groups for such investigations lies in the precise nature of their inheritance, the good distribution of the different forms in a population and the freedom from the influence of environment. For these reasons the blood groups can be used as " markers " for the autosomes in man.

Then follows an account of each of the eight well-established blood group systems, ABO, MN.S, P, Rhesus, Lutheran, Kell, Lewis and Duffy; mention is also made of three other blood group antigens of extreme rarity.

The subject of the ABO groups is a difficult one to confine within the bounds of a single chapter. There is a rather unbalanced allotment of space to the different aspects of the subject, in particular the latest conjectures about the subtleties of the inheritance have been unduly favoured.

The MN groups were discovered in 1927 by Landsteiner and Levine, and the inheritance was subsequently shown to be controlled by two allelomorphic genes, M and N. These groups were once more brought into the limelight when, in 1947, the authors discovered that there was a subdivision within the groups. They suggest that the inherit-